

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Robert Gensemer](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Measurement endpoints table (aka, left side of WOE matrix)
Date: 04/28/2006 09:10 AM
Attachments: [ME Table 26Apr06-jpchanges.xls](#)

Bob,

I got caught up in some other calls after ours yesterday, so I wasn't able to work more on the table. However, I am sending you a version with a few of the changes that need to be made. I did talk to Eric, and we agreed that if we needed to push back the delivery to the LWG to get a better project that would be o.k. Can you merge the two "works in progress" (measurement endpoints and weighting matrix) and send me what you have this morning? I will be able to work on it this afternoon. Maybe we can then agree on an approach that will best suite our needs for the May 9th meeting and for moving forward with the data gaps analysis.

Does that work for you?

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Gensemer [mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 2:09 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Measurement endpoints table (aka, left side of WOE matrix)

Joe, Jen, and Eric:

After our call with LWG yesterday, the group agreed that the final list of measurement endpoints needed to be agreed upon before we can fill out the rest of the weight of evidence (WOE) matrix in a meaningful way. Jen and I talked after the call, and I agreed to provide her with a draft she could discuss with Joe and Lisa sometime this week. Hope this looks OK. Let me know too if you'd like me to listen in on this, but I'm out Friday afternoon, FYI.

The attached table is an amalgam of our Table 6 from the December 2 data gaps memo, and Table 1 of LWG's 15 March Framework. I've also included some of the additional LOE thinking that Jennifer and I have done the last couple of days, but without all the chemical or pathway-specific detail we were trying out. Thought this would be simpler for now.

As you'll also see from the last column, my intent is for the WOE columns, R3 data gap implications, and HQ approach columns to be appended to the right of these existing columns. We're still thinking about qualitative vs. quantitative WOE approaches, but this will require more work to determine which WOE attributes and weighting methods we want to propose. We had a great conversation with LWG about this yesterday, and think that we should actually still consider the possibility of a quantitative approach.

All for now. Hope the meeting is going well today.
-Bob

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
Parametrix, Inc.
33972 Texas Street SW
Albany, OR 97321
T 541-791-1667, x-6510
F 541-791-1669
C 541-760-1511
rgensemer@parametrix.com
